

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

REC'D 13 MAY 2005

WIPO

PCT

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:
NARENDRA THAPPETA
LAW FIRM OF NAREN THAPPETA
158 PHASE ONE, ADARSH PALM MEADOWS
AIRPORT-WHITEFIELD ROAD, RAMAGUN-DANAHALLI
BANGALORE, KARNATAKA, INDIA 560 066

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) **11 MAY 2005**

Applicant's or agent's file reference

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

CDOT-001-PCT

International application No.

International filing date (day/month/year)

Priority date (day/month/year)

PCT/IN04/00283

08 September 2004 (08.09.2004)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

IPC(7): G06F 9/46, 13/00, 13/14, 13/36, 13/40, 15/00 and US Cl.: 710/123, 40, 105, 51, 107, 41; 712/29; 370/402, 431, 537;
709/207; 714/48; 340/2.1

Applicant

CENTRE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF TELEMATICS

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US

Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230

Authorized officer

Gopal C. Ray

Telephone No. (571) 272-3631

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IN04/00283

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

☐ a sequence listing

☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

☐ in written format

☐ in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

☐ contained in international application as filed.

☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/IN04/00283

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>6-12 and 14-21</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-5 and 13</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims <u>6-12 and 14-21</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-5 and 13</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-21</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1-5 and 13 lack novelty under PCT article 33(2) as being anticipated by US Patent 4,870,704 issued to Matelan et al.

As to claim 1, the reference of Matelan et al. teaches "using a first set of signals to send control signals in a first duration, said first set of signal lines being comprised in said message bus; and using said first set of signal lines to send data bits between said plurality of modules in a second duration" in col. 38, line 57 - col. 39, line 6.

As per claims 2-3, the reference of Matelan et al. teaches "data transfer phase" and "arbitration phase" with associated circuitry in col. 39, line 7 - col. 40, line 46.

As per claims 4-5, the reference of Matelan et al. teaches "module requests and grant" in Figures 14-15 and col. 29, line 29 - 68.

As per claim 13, the claim recites an apparatus. However, the limitations are parallel to the combination of method claims 1 and 2. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1 and 2 are also applicable here. In teaching the construction and use of the device, the reference of Matelan et al. teaches a corresponding apparatus.

Claims 6-12 and 14-21 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2) -(3) because each claim recites an additional feature such as "determining in said first module whether a BUSY signal is asserted, wherein said BUSY signal indicates whether any of said plurality of modules is available on said message bus", etc. in claim 6 in combination with other claimed elements which the prior art of record does not teach or fairly suggest.

Claims 1-21 have industrial applicability under PCT Article 33(4) because the subject matter can be made or used in industry.